Unpublished Letter to Bare In Mind,
Nikki Craft Answers Lawrence Stanley's Accusation
That the ICONoclast Published Child Pornography

As uploaded to the project under the filename "!Bare In Mind:Stanley.txt" — reproduced here in full, exactly as written, for your own reading rather than reconstructed from search fragments. Corrected only for minor spelling/typo errors, per the note Nikki herself attached to the original.

Nikki's own preface to the letter

This letter was submitted to Bare In Mind but I'm pretty sure it was never published. The date this letter was written is unknown due to a computer file directory corruption on my laptop in the 1970s that changed a whole series of files to 1997 and wiped out the date the original file was created. It has been corrected for minor spelling errors and typos with no other changes.

Dear Editor:

Regarding Stanley's accusation about the ICONoclast publishing child pornography: The photographs that are appearing in the ICONoclast are published to inform nudists/naturist, the police, government officials and the feminist movement about how some men in the nudist/naturist movement are abusing the women, children and nudist values. I believe other nudist/naturist, particularly, have a right to know what their founding forefathers did with the photographs of they took of their children. These men are oftentimes leaders in the movement like Ed Lange who is owner of Elysium and published Young and Naked and Ed Leja (Lea) who was a primary staff photographer for the American Sunbathing Association for years and who published Nudist Moppets, the series that Stanley mentioned in his letter. The ICONoclast is an expose and the photographs are historical, documentary evidence. They are xeroxed and shrunk to a size of 1 inch square copies of originals published in glossy, full-page color, sold (for profit) and then mailed in plain brown envelopes to an audience of 'adults only' i.e. men to be used for masturbatory aids. The ethical difference in what I am doing and what Ed Leja did should be obvious. As always I will take responsibility for legal ramifications.

Over the years Stanley and I have spoken on four occasions. In April of last year we had a pleasant one hour conversation where I asked him hundreds of questions which he answered quite graciously. During this conversation I asked whether it is customary, in political cases for lawyers to take into consideration whether citations in a legal brief might contradict the desired long term political goals of involved organizations. He assured me that they do not. It is easy to believe that lawyers operate this way. But, as a political activist I will not chart my course by where lawyers lead, when I know lawyers are the ones making the bad laws and they are operating with no ethical judgments to get there, with less of an eye for what justice or vindication might be than a lot of ordinary folks. As a layperson I have a perfect right to make political judgments and have an opinion about the Oakes case and to disassociate myself from those who align with Douglas Oakes if I so choose.

Then before moving onto another topic Stanley and I talked briefly about my concerns about the political implications of the Hustler citation in the Oakes case and the nudists support of Douglas Oakes. It is obvious that he misunderstood if he thought my objections to the Hustler citation were just because I object to the content of Hustler. Because I have formulated political analysis and speak opinions and act as an advocate on behalf of women Stanley calls me an ideologue who is 'incapable of understanding the nature of legal discourse.' Spare me the legal discourse Larry, just give me some justice.

And these two cases are not about justice. The facts regarding both the Oakes case and the Hustler case concern me, and others, greatly. Oakes is a non-nudist who photographed his 14 year-old step daughter on top of a bar in Playboy-styled photographs without her shirt on while she assuming seductive poses. When she saw the photographs she ripped them up and buried them in the back yard. When Douglas Oakes found out about this he told her to go dig them up. After the child dug the photos up she told her mother who filed for divorce. Douglas Oakes got charged with child pornography. Even though I do not believe Oakes should have gotten such a severe sentence (I do believe he should have done some time) but I maintain that he is not a man the nudist/naturist movement should have defended, if not on principal, then for purely strategic political reasons.

The reasons I found it doubly appalling that the Hustler citation was used in the Oakes case was this. Though my facts on this case may be a bit sketchy, this is basically the scene. The young woman who sued Hustler was from a liberal, nudist family. She believed in body acceptance and was photographed nude, while she was young, a preteen (I believe). The photograph appeared in a book about nudity and body acceptance and she and her mother were led to believe the photos would be used only for wholesome purpose when they both signed an open-ended model release. Years later the girl was embarrassed and repulsed (I spoke with her and her mother at the time of the trial.) when she found that the photographs had been published in Hustler. She said it was a misappropriation of her image — her body; a violation of her privacy, if you will. She felt harmed. By that time she was in her late teens and she fought Hustler with commitment and courage in the court for years (maybe four or five). She finally lost to Hustler's money and lawyers. (Anyone interested in the legal discourse that Hustler and Penthouse are capable of should read Gerry Spence's book Trial by Fire.)

It is my opinion that if the leaders of the nudist/naturist movement, both the Naturist Society and the American Sunbathing Association, are really fighting for the rights of people to control their own bodies rather than the rights of pornographers to exploit and for the rights of men to have sexual access then these organizations better choose more carefully the cases on which they dump their scarce resources. It will perhaps be a battle that is fought outside the courtroom.

Most of all nudists/naturists better begin questioning the men more critically who speak on behalf of pedophiles and this means especially Lawrence Stanley. Stanley claims that I misquoted him and have published innuendo. The following is a very close transcription of our conversation with regards to that portion of our conversation. And if Stanley denies that he said this he is a liar.

NC: Do you know Tim Wilcox?

LS: No I don't. Is he the Tim Wilcox — the photographer — who was indicted for — uh — sex.

NC: For sex?

LS: Yes

NC: (I laughed cynically.) For having sex with a minor?

LS: Was he ever convicted?

NC: Yes, he pled guilty

LS: Just recently? Wasn't that years ago? Wasn't the sex years ago?

NC: How do you know about his arrest years ago?

LS: Because he is in a senate report from 1978 in connection with the childhood sensuality people.

NC: Is he?

LS: Yes. (Then I asked him how to get the report and what the report said.) Basically it just linked him to a quote — unquote sex ring which was obviously just a number of people who were just having sex. But there was very little information and I never looked into it.

True, when I asked Stanley if he knew Tim Wilcox he said he did not know him. I never said that he did and I did not mean to imply that he did. The point is that Stanley had quite a bit of information on the Tim Wilcox/John Duncan matter. He had the chart where the children aged __ to ___ were sold into prostitution. He had seen the chart of all the men involved and he had read the testimony of Joseph Henry. BIM readers who are interested in knowing what Stanley really knew need only to go back and read those three items that were printed in the ____ issue.

The crucial point here though is that I did not misrepresent Stanley's position. It was impossible to give all the information that I knew about Stanley in Vol. 1 #5. I didn't feel I needed to because I knew that a complete issue of the ICONoclast would be devoted to more detailed information about him and Marc Schuyten whom he has worked closely with on a computer bulletin board service called Families Naturally. The coming issue of the ICONoclast is called 'Families Naturally, A Pedophile Computer Service: They're Just One Big Happy Family.' The ICONoclast will tell about Schuyten's arrest in Southern California on child pornography charges. (Those charges were later dropped, but many questions about Schuyten still remain, particularly since, for years, he was head of naturist family groups.) It will also tell about Stanley's newsletter 'Uncommon Desires' about having sex with children — young girls to be exact — that he has edited for over a year under the pseudonym n.s. aristoff.

You see, one thing that was not mentioned in the ICONoclast is that Stanley is not only a tireless advocate for pedophiles — he is one himself. For that I am not advising that Stanley be stoned. Lawrence Stanley is a right nice guy as far as I can gather, with far better values on a whole than many of the men involved in naturism/naturism. But I do advise nudist/naturists to listen to him and know that behind his alleged lawyer's objectivity regarding child pornography and sex with children issues lies a false objectivity. Lawrence Stanley, like so many, is driven by his own special, private agenda.

Stanley is currently listed in the American Sunbathing Association's 'Nudist's Legal Directory' which lists attorneys active in the nudist lifestyle. He attends nude beaches and a nudist club in Canada on a regular basis.

Lastly I would say nudist parents better watch Stanley (and his friends) when they are around kids at nudist camps and the nude beaches. Stanley was put in charge of New Games (the children's workshop) at the first east coast Naturist Society event that he ever attended at _____.

Any readers of 'Bare In Mind' who would like more information on the subject about child pornography and pedophiles in the nudist/naturist movement can write the ICONoclast for themselves may subscribe by sending a $25.00 donation to N.O.P.E. (Nudists and Naturist Opposing Pornographic Exploitation, P.O. Box XXXX, Oak Ridge, North Carolina.

Nikki Craft